DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 881 CS 503 933

AUTHOR deTurck, Mark A.; Miller, Gerald R.
TITLE Adolescent Perceptions of Parental Persuasive Message Strategies.
PUB DATE May 82
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (Boston, MA, May 2-5, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Communication Research; *Parent Child Relationship; *Parent Influence; Parent Role; *Persuasive Discourse; *Power Structure; Secondary Education; Sex Differences; *Student Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Uniting research on parental control techniques with studies examining adolescents' perceptions of conjugal and parental power, this study investigates adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive communication. One hundred ninety adolescents from two small midwestern high schools were asked to complete a questionnaire. The first four sections of the questionnaire described situations involving some conflict of interest between a student's parents and the student. Students were asked to role play in each situation and to decide which parent would be most likely to invoke the 16 persuasive message strategies from a theoretical typology. These sections also contained items assessing the validity of each compliance-gaining situation. The fifth section was composed of an additional seven items assessing adolescent perceptions of conjugal power for use in another study. The final section contained questions requesting students to supply demographic information. Results indicated that depending on age, gender, and context, adolescents report fathers or mothers invoke a variety of persuasive messages that cannot be classified in two-dimensional space: coercion and induction. More specifically, a host of persuasive messages emerged as indicators of the dimensions underlying adolescent perceptions of parental influence. (HOD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED220881

ADOLESCENT PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTAL PERSUASIVE MESSAGE STRATEGIES

Mark A. deTurck

Department of Communication
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824

(517) 355-2170

Gerald R. Miller

Department of Communication
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824

(517) 355-9659

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark A. deTurck

Gerald R. Miller

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS503933

ADOLESCENT PERCEPTIONS OF PARENTAL PERSUASIVE MESSAGE STRATEGIES

Students of the family have devoted considerable research energy toward understanding the process of social power in family interactions. Family power processes refer to the patterns of interaction among family members in a variety of contexts involving social influence, e.g., decision-making, problem-solving, conflict-resolution, and crisis-management (Olson & Cromwell, 1975). Families function as unique social milieus complete with superordinate-subordinate relationships within their structure, especially with respect to parent-child relationships. Given the tremendous potential for parents to influence their children, parental control techniques exercised in socializing children become paramount.

Research examining the impact of parental control techniques on children's socialization has been plagued by a lack of conceptual sophistication. Despite a large literature dealing with message factors in persuasive communication, conceptualizations of parental control techniques are limited to two general classifications: coercion and induction. Coercion, or power assertions, refers to a force appeal invoked by a parent during a power confrontation with a child (see, for example, Hoffman, 1960; Rollins & Thomas, 1979). On the one hand, coercive communication implies the threat of physical punishment and/or the deprivation of desired commodities or privileges. Induction, on the other hand, is defined as an attempt by parents to obtain "voluntary" compliance with their request and thus avoid a confrontation of wills with their children (Rollins & Thomas, 1979). Obviously, the lack of conceptual rigor in specifying the spectrum of persuasive message strategies available to persons seeking to influence other family members limits the generalizations we can distill from the existing body of family power literature. For instance what about the obverse of coercive strategies, i.e.,

promising rewards in return for compliance with the persuasive request? Or, in terms of an inductive appeal, what types of reasons are offered in defense of the parent's persuasive request? To the extent parental compliance-gaining strategies are based on qualitatively distinct appeals there is a need in the family power literature for research based on a more refined typology of parental control techniques.

One research strategy for determining the range of parental persuasive messages would be to sample adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive message strategies. Adolescents have an extensive relational history as experienced targets for parental persuasive attempts. Moreover, research investigating adolescent perceptions of conjugal and parental power has proved useful in understanding the family power structure (Bahr, Bowerman & Gecas, 1974; Bowerman & Elder, 1964; McDonald, 1977, 1979, 1980; Smith, 1970).

The objective of this study is to unite the literature studying parental control techniques and the literature investigating adolescent perceptions of parental and conjugal power. By asking adolescents to report the persuasive strategies their parents invoke, students of family power may be in a better position to understand parent-child power relationships. Using a typology of persuasive messages developed by Marwell and Schmitt (1967a), the specific purposes of the present study are twofold: first, to determine if adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive message strategies correspond with adolescent perceptions of parental and conjugal power; second, to determine the extent to which adolescents perceive their parents employ a more varied persuasive message repertory than indicated by research on parental control techniques (see, for example, Rollins & Thomas, 1979).

A TYPOLOGY OF PERSUASIVE MESSAGE STRATEGIES

Efforts to develop taxonomies of persuasive message strategies have assumed radically divergent methodological postures (Falbo, 1977; Marwell & Schmitt, 1967; Wiseman & Schenck-Hamlin, 1981). More specifically, Falbo (1977) and Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981), for instance, inductively derived their typologies by asking respondents to generate persuasive messages strategies they would employ in a given social context. Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin's (1981) typology consists of 14 persuasive messages aligned in a four dimensional configuration. By contrast, Marwell and Schmitt (1967a) reviewed the relevant literature on persuasive message strategies in order to construct a taxonomy of symbolic compliance-gaining behaviors. Their review generated a domain of 16 persuasive message strategies available to potential persuaders.

Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981) argued that their typological approach more accurately and parsimoneously reflects persuader's message domains. Despite their contention, Marwell and Schmitt's a priori taxonomy provides a more heuristic tool for investigating message factors in social influence. The argument from parsimony is falacious given only a difference of two messages between the two taxonomies. Moreover, that each message in Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin's (1981) typology corresponds with a message in Marwell and Schmitt's (1967a) typology indicates that the former contributes no additional information. In short, Marwell and Schmitt's taxonomy provides greater conceptual specificity without sacrificing parsimony.

Based on 608 undergraduates indicating how likely that would be to invoke each of the 16 persuasive messages in four different situations, Marwell and Schmitt (1967a) obtained a seven factor solution; however, they reported

only five: Rewarding Activity, Punishing Activity, Expertise, Activation of Impersonal Commitments, and Activation of Personal Commitments. Their five factor solution of persuasive communication suggests that previous conceptualizations of parental control techniques suffered from oversimplification. This argument is buttressed by the fact that future mothers rated promising as a persuasive strategy very likely to achieve their persuasive goal in a domestic context (Marwell & Schmitt, 1967b). More specifically, Marwell and Schmitt (1967b) reported that of the 16 persuasive message strategies examined across all four situations, only in the family context did mothers-to-be judge the efficacy of promising to be greater than the probability of employing this strategy. Yet one is hard pressed to locate a control technique involving positive sanctions in the pages of family journals. Although Marwell and Schmitt's (1967a) factor structure is subject to inter-situation variance (Burgoon, Dillard & Doran, 1981; Miller, Boster, Roloff, & Seibold, 1977), it provides a broad foundation of persuasive message strategies for studying parental control techniques.

Adolescent Perceptions of Conjugal and Parental Power

To be sure, adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive message strategies will determine to a great extent how adolescents respond to parental requests for compliance (Rollins & Thomas, 1975, 1979). While adolescents differ in their perception of conjugal and parental power (Bahr, Bowerman & Begas, 1974; Bowerman & Elder, 1964; McDonald, 1977, 1979, 1980; Smith, 1970), researchers have not determined how adolescents perceive parental control techniques. An adolescent's age and sex, for example, influence how he/she perceives the parental power structure. More specifically, male adolescents are more likely

to perceive fathers as the dominant family figure whereas females typically report mothers are more dominant (Bahr, et al., 1974). Moreover, this tendency to favor same-sex parents in the family power structure is more pronounced among older adolescents.

For the most part, differences in adolescent perceptions of conjugal and power have focused on parental resource variables. Resource theorists argue that to the extent a family member monopolizes some commodity needed by other family members, he/she has control over them (Blood & Wolfe, 1960; Centers, Raven & Rodrigues, 1971). Parental resources such as occupational status, educational background, or some composite of these variables contribute toward adolescent perceptions of the parental power structure.

While the relative distribution of family resources may influence the family power structure, it seems tenuous, conceptually, that adolescents take parental resources into account when judging which parent, if any, dominates the other. Rather, adolescent inferences of parental power probably arise from parental behavior during situations involving power confrontations. Attribution theorists (Jones & Davis, 1965) for example, would argue that adolescent inferences of parental power are based on parental attempts to control children's behavior. Research in persuasion has consistently identified the influence of specific message factors on receivers' perceptions of source credibility, status, and similarity (see, e.g., Bradac, Bowers & Courtright, 1979). To the extent attributions are based on acts, a more useful way to approach adolescent perceptions of conjugal and parental power lies in examining adolescent perceptions of parental control techniques.

A model of dispositional attributions from acts provides a more conceptually satisfying approach than resource theory for examining family power processes.

Unless resources come into play during a power confrontation they exert minimal influence on power attributions. Indeed, resources do not have to change hands during an interaction for them to influence perceptions of power. Symbolic control techniques which require the source to actively manipulate some resource may generate perceptions of power to a greater extent than if the source merely possesses the commodity. More specifically, in terms of Marwell and Schmitt's (1967a) factor structure, parents who have a penchant for invoking rewarding and punishing activity strategies may create a greater image of power than parents who have similar resources but do not refer to them during symbolic exchanges. Thus, studying adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive message strategies serves as a necessary step toward understanding adolescent perceptions of parental power.

Research Questions

In addition to the literature mentioned above concerning gender differences in the way adolescents perceive parental power, a substantial body of persuasion literature attests to the impact of gender differences during situations involving social influence (see, e.g., McGuire, 1969). Although gender appears to have relatively little effect on the selection of persuasive message strategies (Burgoon et al., 1981; deTurck & Miller, in press), the present interest lies in adolescent perceptions of persuasive message srategies used by parents. Findings from this vantage point will yield insight as to how male and female adolescents perceive parental attempts to control their behavior. Based on the above discussion, the following research question sought to reveal if male and female adolescents perceive parental control attempts differently.

Q1: How does gender influence adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive message strategies?

While research has determined that younger and older adolescents differ in their perceptions of conjugal and parental power, the effects of age on adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive strategies have not been explored. One explanation for the differences in the way adolescents perceive conjugal/parental power is couched in a developmental approach to family power processes. As children pass from preadolescence through their teens, parents modify their persuasive strategies so as to accomodate their children's increasing maturity, intelligence and independence (Richer, 1968). In keeping with our earlier discussion of the role of attribution theory in family power, differences in perceptions of conjugal/parental power may reflect differences in parental persuasive techniques; parents may rely on certain persuasive message strategies when exerting influence over younger adolescents whereas parents with older adolescents may endorse a separate set of persuasive message strategies. Formally,

Q2: How does age influence adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive message strategies?

As a communication activity, selection of persuasive message strategies is highly situationally bound (Burgoon et al., 1981; Miller et al., 1977). Relational control techniques are also subject to the same inter-situational variance as in the above studies. Raven, Centers and Rodrigues (1975), for example, found the bases for conjugal power attributed to one's spouse change significantly across domains of power. To the extent parents modify their use of persuasive messages across situations, adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive communication should also vary across communicative contexts. The final research question was advanced to test the extent adolescents perceive parents employ different message strategies across communicative contexts.

Q3: How does the communicative context influence adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive message strategies?

METHOD

Sample

One hundred and ninety adolescents from two small midwestern communities served as respondents in the present study (99 females and 91 males). The participants were predominantly white, middle-class students ranging from seventh to twelfth grade. Schools were selected on the basis of their willingness to participate in the study. Student participation occurred during regularly scheduled classes. Since all students were required to enroll in English and History, these classes were sampled so as to provide diversity in students' intelligence, background and interests.

Procedure

After the researcher was introduced to each class, he read aloud to the students the questionnaire cover page regarding the nature of the study and directions for completing the questionnaire. Only students currently living with male and female parent figures completed the questionnaire. Parent figures included biological parents, step-parents, adopting parents, or an older married sibling with parental responsibility over his/her younger siblings.

Questionnaire

Each questionnaire contained six major sections. The first four sections described situations involving some conflict of interest between a student's parents and the student (Table 1). Students were asked to role-play in each situation and to decide which parent would be most likely to invoke the 16 persuasive message strategies from Marwell and Schmitt's (1967a) typology.

Table 1 About Here

Criticisms of the Marwell and Schmitt typology (Burgoon, Dillard & Doran, 1981; Miller, 1980; Miller, Boster, Roloff & Seibold, 1977) suggest at least two modifications are necessary to make the typology more conceptually satisfying. First, as defined by Marwell and Schmitt (1967a), liking is not a persuasive message strategy, but rather a conglomeration of behaviors one engages in so as to realize some relational rewards. Thus, unlike the other 15 strategies, liking cannot be distilled into a single message strategy that can be invoked during a symbolic exchange. Second, the present study extended moral appeal to include both positive and negative appeals so as to remain consistent with altercasting, expertise, and self-feeling strategies. With these two modifications, the form of each strategy, along with an example from the second situation in Table 1, is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2 About Here

Following each compliance-gaining situation, students rated each of the 16 persuasive message strategies along a seven point Likert-type scale ranging from "Father Almost Always" to "Mother Almost Always," with the midpoint on each scale specifying that both father and mother were about equally likely to invoke a given persuasive message.

The first four sections also contained items assessing the validity of each compliance-gaining situation. Although the situations were designed to address salient aspects of adolescents' lives, six questions served as manipulation checks and followed adolescent ratings of parental persuasive message use. The items used to test the efficacy of the four compliance-gaining situations were selected from Cody and McLaughlin's (1980) study which extracted six cognitive dimensions individuals engage when assessing

compliance-gaining episodes: Intimacy, dominance, resistance, rights, personal benefits and long term consequences. While Cody and McLaughlin (1980) provide numerous items for evaluating each cognitive dimension, the six items loading highest on the six respective dimensions were used so as to minimize response fatigue.

The fifth section was composed of an additional seven items assessing adolescent perceptions of conjugal power for use in another study. Several samples of the items in this section include: "When important family problems come up, which parent usually has the most to say in making the decision?", "When your parents disagree about something that should be done, which one usually gets their way about it?", "When your parents disagree about your punishment, which parent usually makes the final decision?". A seven point Likert-type response scale was employed to assess adolescent's perceptions of conjugal power. The final section in the questionnaire contained questions requesting students to supply demographic information to be used in the study. Included were items asking for a student's age, gender, number of older and younger brothers and sisters, religious preference, race/ethnic background, parental educational levels and parental occupations.

RESULTS

Factor Analyses

To determine if there was a consistent underlying structure in the message perception data, four separate factor analyses were performed, one for each

situation. Each set of strategies was analyzed using a principal factor design with varimax rotations. All factor structures were interpreted in light of a .50 - .30 criterion, i.e., for an item to be considered as loading on a dimension, it had to load .50 or above on its primary factor and all secondary loadings had to be below .30. In the interest of conserving space, Table 3 presents the factor structures for those persuasive messages satisfying this criterion. Since no interpretable factor structure emerged for all strategies, messages were treated as 16 separate dependent variables in subsequent analyses.

Tests for Ages and Gender Effects

To answer the first two research questions, four separate 2 x 3 multivariate analyses of variance were conducted to determine the effects of age and sex on adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive activity. Since respondents ranged from 11 to 19 years of age, they were divided into three groups: Preadolescence (11-12 years, N = 66), adolescence (13-15 years, N = 66), and late adolescence (16-19 years, N = 58). Wilks' Lamda was examined for each potential main effect and interaction effect. For all statistical tests, the .05 level of significance was used. Analysis of the data yielded the following results.

Multivariate Tests

Two of the four situations yielded significant age-by-sex interactions. In the situation where parents want their child to help with the spring cleaning, the interaction between adolescents' age and gender was significant (Λ = .76). The main effects for age and sex were not statistically significant (Λ = .91 and Λ = .81, respectively). The second age-by-sex interaction occurred in the situation where parents wanted their child to seek employment

(Λ = .80). There was a main effect for age (Λ = .60), however, the main effect for sex only showed a trend toward significance (Λ = .88, $p > .059$).

That adolescents' age and sex simultaneously influence their perceptions of parental persusive message strategies indicates the first two research questions cannot be answered individually. Given the significant outcomes of these omnibus tests, subsequent univariate analyses were conducted to determine exactly how age and gender influence adolescent perceptions of particular parental message strategies.

Univariate Tests

To ascertain which strategies were influenced by adolescent age and sex, univariate analyses of variance were examined in each situation. In the situation where parents were persuading their child to assist with the spring cleaning, there was a significant age-by-sex interaction for pregiving, aversive stimulation, and positive moral appeal (Table 4).

Table 4 About Here

More specifically, preadolescent males reported their mothers were more likely to invoke these strategies while older adolescent males perceived their fathers more likely to use them. Female perceptions were just the opposite; pre-adolescent females perceived their fathers would be more likely to use these strategies while older females reported their mothers use these strategies more often than their fathers. Adolescents in their mid-teens indicated their mothers were more likely to invoke a debt appeal than their fathers.

When parents were persuading their child to find a job, there was a significant age-by-gender interaction for negative esteem (Table 5).

Table 5 About Here

In this situation, preadolescent males perceive their fathers use negative esteem more than their mothers while males in their later teens reported their mothers are more likely to endorse this persuasive strategy. Again, female perceptions were just the opposite of males.

For the situation where adolescents judged which parent would invoke persuasive message strategies encouraging them to seek employment, adolescent age was an especially important determinant for four strategies: Negative expertise, pregiving, aversive stimulation, and negative esteem (Table 5). Fathers were perceived to invoke negative expertise and pregiving by adolescents in their later teens while adolescents in their mid-teens reported their fathers would invoke aversive stimulation more often than their mothers. The age-by-sex interaction for negative esteem overrides the main effect for age.

Gender differences produced a significant effect for negative esteem when parents were persuading adolescents to seek employment (F, 1/160 = 4.68). Along with the age effect, however, the gender effect is tempered by the significant age-by-sex interaction for negative esteem. There were also trends toward significance based on gender in the employment situation for promise (F, 1/160 = 3.34, p = .069) and negative expertise (F, 1/160 = 3.74, p = .054). Males perceive their mothers as more likely to invoke promise and negative expertise than the females. However, females report their mothers are more likely to use negative esteem to persuade them.

Effects of Communicative Context

Given the way data were collected and arrayed, context could not be included in the MANOVA analysis discussed above. However, there are at least two other methods for assessing situational influences on adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive message strategies.

Miller et al., (1977) utilized a clustering technique to examine if different compliance-gaining situations produced different clusters or dimensions of persuasive message selection. More specifically, Miller et al., (1977) examined the variability in the underlying factor structures governing communicators' selection of persuasive messages across four different communicative contexts. To examine the variability in the dimensions underlying adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive message strategies, we scrutinized the factor analyses presented in Table 3. To the extent the four factor solutions differ, dimensions of adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive message strategy usage vary across communicative contexts.

Several major differences among the factor structures in Table 3 indicates situational factors affected adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive message strategies. First, the variation in the number of dimensions characterizing each factor solution (4-6) suggests that varying communicative contexts evoke different patterns of cognitive dimensions for evaluating parental persuasive message use. Second, there is very little consistency in the persuasive messages which define the dimensions underlying adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive strategies. Although several message types appear in three factor solutions, there is very little reliability in factors across solutions. In the first situation, for instance, Factor I is defined by three message types, whereas in the third situation, Factor I is defined by eight message types. Moreover, several factors are defined by rotating around a single message strategy or strategies which failed to satisfy the .50-.30 decision criterion indicating the instability of these factor solutions.

Another way to examine context effects is evinced in the patterns of adolescent responses in the spring cleaning and employment situations.

First, the divergent patterns of age-by-sex interactions in the spring cleaning and employment situations reflect how different communicative contexts, within a more general domestic environment, can evoke varying perceptions of parental persuasive strategies. Second, the number of different strategies which emerged as significant between the spring cleaning and employment situations indicates adolescents may associate certain parental persuasive message strategies with a given communicative context. For example, pregiving, aversive stimulation, positive moral appeal, and debt discriminated among adolescents in terms of parental usage in the spring cleaning situation while negative esteem, negative expertise, aversive stimulation and pregiving emerged as strategies fathers and mothers use differently in the employment situation.

DISCUSSION

That adolescents perceive differences in parental persuasive message usage suggests previous conceptualizations of parental control techniques as falling along two broad dimensions may obscure the process of parental influence. Depending on age, gender and context, adolescents reported fathers or mothers invoke a variety of persuasive messages that cannot be classified in two dimensional space: Coercion and induction. More specifically, a host of persuasive messages emerged as indicators of the dimensions underlying adolescent perceptions of parental influence. Moreover, the present study indicates there are more than two dimensions of parental persuasive message strategies defined by messages that are conceptually distinct from coercion and induction. To the extent adolescents perceive parents differentially employ a wider range of persuasive messages than the existing body of literature has investigated, future research focusing on parental influence would profit from adopting an expanded view of parental persuasive message strategies.

The cross-over interaction observed in the situation where parents are persuading adolescents to assist with the spring cleaning supports an attribution interpretation of adolescent perceptions of the family power structure. As adolescents mature, they perceive the same-sex parent as more instrumental in attempting to persuade them. This finding parallels data on adolescent perceptions of same-sex parents as more powerful, particularly among older adolescents (Bahr et al., 1974). Thus, adolescent perceptions of the family power structure may be a function of the persuasive exchange during power confrontations. A study by deTurck (1982a) provides additional support for the relationship between parental persuasive message strategies and adolescent perceptions of parental power, revealing that parents who rely on threat as a persuasive technique are perceived to wield less power than their non-threatening counterparts.

Results from the situation where parents are persuading adolescents to seek part time employment contradict an attribution model of parental power based on persuasive message selection. In this situation, older adolescents reported the opposite-sex parent was more instrumental in persuading them. This finding may perhaps be a situational artifact. More specifically, employment is especially salient to adolescents in their mid to upper teens. The impact of age on the perception of parental persuasive strategies confirms this analysis (see Table 4). Adolescents in the two older age groups reported fathers were more likely than mothers to attempt to persuade them. Thus, while the same-sex parent generally may be most influential for older adolescents, situational determinants can override adolescent perceptions of parental power.

To what can we attribute the lack of significant findings for the other two situations? Responses to the items from Cody and McLaughlin (1980)

designed to test adolescents' role-playing involvement indicated that these situations were not particiularly salient to them. More specifically, students reported they did not have especially good reasons for doing what they wanted and that it was not particularly important for them to get their own way. Rollins and Bahr (1976) argue that power only becomes an issue when a conflict of goals exists between family members. The failure of these two situations to yield significant results may be due to a lack of motivation for adolescent role-playing.

The absence of significance in two of the situations suggests other factors may also affect adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive message strategies. In a recent study, deTurck (1982b) presented evidence indicating adolescents perceive parents with comparatively greater resource bases to be more active in attempting to persuade children. Compared to lesser endowed parents, parents with a more extensive resource base are better equipped to invoke persuasive message strategies since they have the resources to reinforce their persuasive request. It may also be the case that an adolescent's own personal repertory of persuasive message selections biases his/her perceptions of others' persuasive message strategies. Researchers operating from a constructivist paradigm have consistently demonstrated the relationship between childrens' cognitive complexity and the type of persuasive messages they generate (Clark & Delia, 1967, 1977). Additional research is necessary not only to reveal the basis of adolescent perceptions of parental persuasive communication but also to discover how these perceptions influence adolescent perceptions of parental power, and subsequently, how parental persuasive communication affects adolescent compliance with requests during ongoing interaction.

Table 1

Four Compliance-Gaining Situations

Situation #1

Your best friend is throwing a big party this weekend. All your friends from school will be there. Your parents don't want you to go to the party. Instead, they want you to go with them to visit relatives. If you went with your parents you would miss the party.*

Situation #2

Your parents have decided that the house needs spring cleaning and they would like you to pitch in and help this Saturday. However, you and a group of friends made plans last week to go to Cedar Point this Saturday.*

Situation #3

Your parents have decided that you are not doing as well in school as they think you can. They want you to increase the amount of time you study each week.*

Situation #4

Your parents have decided that you are old enough to get a job and earn some of your own spending money. They want you to work around 10-12 hours a week at the job you like best. You do not want to work because you feel you won't have enough time for your school work and friends.*

---

*Each situation was followed by the following instructions:

Below are some things your parents might say in order to do what they want. We would like you to read each statement and decide whether your father or your mother would say it most often.

Table 2

Sixteen Persuasive Message Strategies With Examples from the Spring Cleaning Situation

1.	Promise	(If you comply, I will reward you.) "If you stay home and clean the house, I will give you ten dollars."
2.	Threat	(If you do not comply, I will punish you.) "If you don't stay home and help clean the house, I will not let you go to Cedar Point for the whole summer."
3.	Expertise (Positive)	(If you comply, you will be rewarded because of the "nature of things.") "If you learn how to care for a home now, you will be able to afford one when you are old enough."
4.	Expertise (Negative)	(If you do not comply, you will be punished because of "the nature of things.") "If you don't know how to keep a house in shape you won't be able to afford one when you are old enough."
5.	Pregiving	(You owe me compliance because of past favors.) "Since I raised your allowance not too long ago, I expect you to help out with the cleaning this Saturday
6.	Debt	(Actor rewards target before requesting compliance.) "Since I let you go out with your friends last weekend, you owe it to me to help clean the house this Saturday."
7.	Aversive Stimulation	(Actor continuously punishes target making cessation contingent on compliance.) "If you don't help out this Saturday, you will have to do the dishes every night until you learn to do your share of the work around here."
8.	Moral Appeals (Positive)	(You are moral if you comply.) "As a member of this family, it is morally right for you to help out around here with the work."
9.	Moral Appeals (Negative)	(You are immoral if you do not comply.) "It is morally wrong for you not to pitch in and help out with the cleaning, as a member of this family."

10.	Self-Feeling (Positive)	(You will feel better about yourself if you comply.) "You will feel better about yourself if you stay and help out this Saturday."
11.	Self-Feeling (Negative)	(You will feel worse about yourself if you do not comply.) "You will feel ashamed of yourself for not staying home on Saturday and helping us out with the cleaning."
12.	Altercasting (Positive)	(A person with "good" qualities would comply.) "You are a young adult and it's time you started taking more responsibility around the house by helping this Saturday."
13.	Altercasting (Negative)	(Only a person with "bad" qualities would comply.) "Only someone very childish does not help out around the house."
14.	Altruism	(I need your compliance very badly, so do it for me.) "I want very badly for you to help clean this Saturday and I wish you would stay home as a personal favor to me."
15.	Esteem (Positive)	(People you value will think better of you if you comply.) "The whole family will be very proud of you if you help us out on Saturday."
16.	Esteem (Negative)	(People you value will think worse of you if you do not comply.) "The whole family will be very disappointed in you if you go out this Saturday instead of helping us out around here."

Table 3

Results of Factor Analyses for Four Compliance-Gaining Situations[ab]

SITUATION #1

Message	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V
Threat	-.04	-.02	.62[b]	.20	.03
Expertise Positive	.04	.80[b]	.07	.14	.06
Expertise Negative	.16	.60[b]	.17	-.00	.14
Self-feeling Positive	.20	.12	.06	.74[b]	.02
Altercasting Negative	.07	.20	.22	.06	.74[b]
Altruism	.50[b]	-.06	-.14	.16	-.01
Esteem Positive	.53[b]	.13	-.01	.22	.05
Esteem Negative	.57[b]	.18	.20	.08	.10

SITUATION #2

Message	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV	Factor V	Factor IV
Promise	.02	.06	.08	.00	-.12	.55[b]
Threat	.27	-.01	.16	-.00	.66[b]	-.11
Expertise Positive	.14	.25	-.01	.89[b]	.08	.02
Expertise Negative	.19	.21	.20	.51[b]	-.03	.03
Moral Appeal Positive	.67[b]	.15	.20	.08	.19	.03
Moral Appeal Negative	.76[b]	-.02	.09	.13	.17	-.03
Self-feeling Positive	-.01	.50[b]	.05	.19	.18	-.02
Altercasting Negative	.13	-.02	.68[b]	.11	.19	.25

Table 3 (cont.)

SITUATION #3

Message	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV
Debt	.56[b]	.13	-.12	.07
Moral Appeal Negative	.61[b]	-.00	-.17	-.28
Moral Appeal Positive	.62[b]	-.05	-.14	-.10
Altercasting Positive	.50[b]	-.06	.20	-.14
Altercasting Negative	.54[b]	.14	-.16	-.03
Self-feeling Positive	.50[b]	-.09	-.07	.04
Altruism	.53[b]	-.10	-.03	.12
Esteem Positive	.62[b]	.00	-.14	.11

SITUATION # 4

Message	Factor I	Factor II	Factor III	Factor IV
Expertise Positive	.58[b]	.04	.09	.01
Altercasting Positive	.78[b]	.51	-.15	-.08

[a]Factor structures consist of only those items that meet the .50-.30 criterion

[b]Items defining factors

Table 4

Means for Adolescent Perceptions of Parental Persuasive Message Strategy Usage in Spring Cleaning Situation[a,b]

Persuasive Message	Males			Females		
	Pre	Mid	Older	Pre	Mid	Older
Pregiving[c]	3.16	3.10	2.45	2.41	3.26	3.25
Aversive Stimulation[c]	3.67	3.75	2.90	3.70	3.41	4.10
Positive Moral Appeal[c]	3.57	3.55	2.95	2.47	3.13	3.52
Debt[d]	2.76	3.83	3.25	3.65	4.05	3.27

[a]Means presented only for messages that discriminate.

[b]Means based on 7 point scale ranging from (1) "Father Almost Always" to (7) "Mother Almost Always"

[c]Age x Sex Interaction

[d]Main Effect for Age

Table 5

Means for Adolescent Perceptions of Parental Persuasive Message Strategy in the Employment Situation[ab]

Persuasive Message	Males			Females		
	Pre	Mid	Older	Pre	Mid	Older
Pregiving[c]	4.68	3.67	2.64	4.84	4.07	3.77
Negative Expertise[c]	3.68	3.28	2.00	4.23	2.64	1.90
Aversive Stimulation[c]	3.61	1.44	3.00	4.38	2.12	3.80
Negative Esteem[cd]	2.10	3.56	3.41	3.77	3.21	2.87

[a]Means presented only for messages that discriminate

[b]Means based on 7 point scale ranging from (1) "Father Almost Always" to (7) "Mother Almost Always"

[c]Main effect for age

[d]Age x sex interaction

References

Bahr, S.J., C.E. Bowerman, and V. Gecas
1974 "Adolescent perceptions of conjugal power." Social Forces 52 (March): 357-367.

Blood, R.O., Jr. and D.M. Wolfe
1960 Husbands and wives. New York:The Free Press.

Bowerman, C.E. and G.H. Elder, Jr.
1964 "Variations in adolescent perception of family power structure." American Sociological Review 29 (August): 555-567.

Bradac, J., Bowers, J. & Courtright, M.
1979 "Three language variables in communicaiton research: Intensity, immediacy, and diversity." Human Communication Research 5 (Spring): 257-269.

Burgoon, M., J.D. Dillard, and N.E. Doran
1981 "Situational determinants of message strategy selections: An exploratory analysis." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Communication Conference, East Lansing, Michigan.

Centers, R., Raven, B.H., & Rodrigues, A.
1971 "Conjugal power structure: A re-examination." American Sociological Review 36 (April): 264-278.

Clarke, R.A. and J. Delia
1976 "The development of functional persuasive skills in childhood and early adolescence." Child Development 47 (December): 1008-1014.

Clarke, R.A. and J. Delia
1977 "Cognitive complexity, social perspective taking, d functional persuasive skills in second-to-ninth grade childre " Human Communication Research 3 (December): 128-134.

Cody, M.J. and M.L. McLaughlin
1980 "Perceptions of compliance-gaining situations." Communication Monographs 47 (June): 132-148.

deTurck, M.A.
1982 Unpublished data. Department of Communication, Michigan State University. (a)

deTurck, M.A.
1982 "Adolescent perceptions of parental compliance-gaining communication: A test of resource theory." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, Washington, D.C. (b)

deTurck, M.A. & G.R. Miller
in press "The effects of birth order on the persuasive impact of messages and the likelihood of persuasive message selection." Communication (Spring).

Falbo, T.
1977 "Multidimensional scaling of power strategies." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 35 (August): 537-547.

Hoffman, M.L.
1960 "Power assertion by the parent and its impact on the child." Child Development 31 (March): 129-163.

Jones, E.E. and K.E. Davis
1965 Advances in Experimental Social Psychology (Vol. 2). New York: Academic Press.

Lupri, E.
1969 "Contemporary authority patterns in the West German family: A study in cross-national validation." Journal of Marriage and the Family 31 (February): 134-144.

Marwell, G. and D.R. Schmitt
1967a "Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis." Sociometry 30 (December): 350-364(a).

Marwell, G. and D.R. Schmitt
1967b "Attitudes toward parental use of promised rewards to control adolescent behavior." Journal of Marriage and the Family 29 (August): 500-504(b).

McDonald, G.W.
1977 "Parental identification by the adolescent: A social power approach." Journal of Marriage and the Family 39 (November): 705-719.

McDonald, G.W.
1979 "Determinants of adolescent perceptions of maternal and parental power in the family." Journal of Marriage and the Family 40 (November): 757-770.

McDonald, G.W.
1980 "Parental power and adolescents' parental identification: A re-examination." Journal of Marriage and the Family 41 (May): 289- 296.

Michel, A.
1967 "Comparative data concerning the interaction in French and American families." Journal of Marriage and the Family 29 (May): 337-344.

Miller, G.R., Boster, F.J., Roloff, M. & Seibold, D.
1977 "Compliance-gaining message strategies: A typology and some findings concerning the effects of situational differences." Communication Monographs 44 (March): 34-50.

Olson, D.H. & Cromwell, R.E.
1975 "Power in families." In R.E. Cromwell and D.H. Olson (Eds.), Power in families. New York: Halstead Press.

Raven, B.H., Centers, R. & Rodrigues, A.
1975 "The bases of conjugal power." In R.E. Cromwell and D.H. Olson (Eds.), Power in families. New York: Halstead Press.

Richer, S.
1968 "The economics of childbearing." Journal of Marriage and the Family 30 (August): 462-466.

Rollins, B.C. and S. J. Bahr
1976 "A theory of power relationships in marriage." Journal of Marriage and the Family 38 (November): 619-627.

Rollins, B.C. & Thomas, D.L.
1975 "A theory of parental power and child compliance." In R.E. Cromwell and D.E. Olson (Eds.), Power in Families. New York: Halstead Press.

Rollins, B.C., Thomas, D.L.
1979 "Parental support, power, and control techniques in the socialization of children." In W.R. Burr, R. Hill, F.I. Nye & I.L. Reiss (Eds.), Contemporary theories about the family, Vol. 1. New York: The Free Press.

Smith, T.E.
1970 "Foundations of parental influence upon adolescents: An application of social power theory." American Sociological Review 35 (December): 860-872.

Wiseman, R.L. & Schenck-Hamlin, W.
1981 "A multidimensional scaling validation of an inductively-derived set of compliance-gaining strategies." Communication Monographs 48 (December): 251-270.